

JEFFREY D. WOHL (Cal. State Bar No. 96838)  
PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFISKY & WALKER LLP  
55 Second Street, 24th Floor  
San Francisco, California 94105  
Telephone: (415) 856-7000  
Facsimile: (415) 856-7100  
[jeffwohl@paulhastings.com](mailto:jeffwohl@paulhastings.com)

STEPHEN H. HARRIS (Cal. State Bar No. 184608)  
PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFISKY & WALKER LLP  
515 South Flower Street, 25th Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: (213) 683-6000  
Facsimile: (213) 627-0705  
[stephenharris@paulhastings.com](mailto:stephenharris@paulhastings.com)

Attorneys for Defendant  
Los Alamos National Security, LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNIVERSITY PROFESSIONAL AND  
TECHNICAL EMPLOYEES, CWA  
LOCAL 9119, AFL-CIO; RICHARD  
MONTROYA; CATHERINE CHAPMAN;  
THOMAS MARKS; and MANUEL  
TRUJILLO,

Plaintiffs/Petitioners,

vs.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA; LOS  
ALAMOS NATIONAL SECURITY, LLC;  
and DOES 1 TO 40, inclusive,

Defendants/Respondents

No. C-06-03326-SBA

**STIPULATION AND ORDER SETTING  
BRIEFING AND HEARING SCHEDULE FOR  
PARTIES' CROSS-MOTIONS AND RESETTING  
CASE MANAGEMENT DATES**

**STIPULATION**

Plaintiffs University Professional and Technical Employees, CWA Local 9119, AFL-CIO; Richard Montoya; Catherine Chapman; Thomas Marks; and Manual Trujillo, and defendants The Regents of the University of California and Los Alamos National Security, LLC, acting through their respective counsel of record, hereby stipulate as follows:

1. This action was commenced in California Superior Court, Alameda County (the “Superior Court”), on April 18, 2006, and removed to this Court on May 19, 2006.

2. Defendants’ response to plaintiffs’ complaint was due on June 19, 2006.

3. On May 31, 2006, plaintiffs e-filed a First Amended Complaint.

4. Plaintiffs intend to move to remand this action to the Superior Court. Defendants intend to bring motions to dismiss the First Amended Complaint.

5. After conferring, the parties wish to coordinate the scheduling of their respective motions to avoid conflicts with the Court’s hearing availability and their calendars.

6. Accordingly, the parties have agreed and respectfully request that the Court approve the following briefing and hearing schedule for their respective motions:

July 28, 2006: Plaintiffs to e-file their motion to remand.

Defendants to e-file their motions to dismiss (the due date for defendants’ response to plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint would be extended to this date)

August 25, 2006: Parties to e-file their oppositions to the pending motions

September 12, 2006: Parties to e-file their replies in support of their respective motions.

September 26, 2006: Hearing on parties’ respective motions (1:00 p.m.)

7. Because these motions should be decided before the parties embark on case management proceedings, the parties further have agreed and respectfully request that the Court reset the case management dates previously set in this action as follows:

///

///

///

November 2, 2006: Last day for parties to meet and confer regarding initial disclosures, early settlement, ADR processes, and discovery; last day for parties to file ADR certification and either stipulation to ADR process or notice of need for ADR telephone conference

November 22, 2006: Last day for parties to complete their initial disclosures or state objections in Rule 26(f) report, file case management statement and Rule 26(f) report

December 4, 2006: Initial case management conference (3:00 p.m.)

8. By entering into this stipulation, the parties do not waive any objection, claim, or defense they may have.

Dated: June \_\_\_, 2006.

PETER W. SALTZMAN  
ARTHUR A. KRANTZ  
LEONARD CARDER, LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Arthur A. Krantz  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
University Professional and Technical Employees,  
CWA Local 9119, AFL-CIO; Richard Montoya;  
Catherine Chapman; Thomas Marks; and  
Manual Trujillo

Dated: June \_\_\_, 2006.

MARY C. OPPERDAHL  
REED SMITH LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Mary C. Oppedahl  
Attorneys for Defendant  
The Regents of the University of California

Dated: June \_\_\_, 2006.

JEFFREY D. WOHL  
STEPHEN H. HARRIS  
PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey D. Wohl  
Attorneys for Defendant  
Los Alamos National Security, Inc.

**ORDER**

Based on the parties' stipulation, and good cause appearing therefor,

IT IS ORDERED that the Court adopts the following briefing and hearing schedule for the parties' planned motions to remand and to dismiss, and resets case management proceedings, as follows:

July 28, 2006: Plaintiffs to e-file their motion to remand.

Defendants to e-file their motions to dismiss (the due date for defendants' response to plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint is hereby extended to this date)

August 25, 2006: Parties to e-file their oppositions to the pending motions

September 12, 2006: Parties to e-file their replies in support of their respective motions.

September 26, 2006: Hearing on parties' respective motions (1:00 p.m.)

November 2, 2006: Last day for parties to meet and confer regarding initial disclosures, early settlement, ADR processes, and discovery; last day for parties to file ADR certification and either stipulation to ADR process or notice of need for ADR telephone conference

November 22, 2006: Last day for parties to complete their initial disclosures or state objections in Rule 26(f) report, file case management statement and Rule 26(f) report

December 4, 2006: Initial case management conference set for December 6, 2006, at 2:30 p.m. Plaintiff's counsel is to set up the conference call with all the parties on the line and call chambers at (510) 637-3559.

Dated: June 12, 2006.

  
Saundra Brown Armstrong  
United States District Judge